



41

**PATENT APPLICATION**

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

**RECEIVED**

NOV 16 2004

Technology Center 2600

In re application of

Docket No: Q60031

Hidemi SASAKI

Appln. No.: 09/615,732

Group Art Unit: 2622

Confirmation No.: 4947

Examiner: Twyler Marie LAMB

Filed: July 13, 2000

For: ELECTRONIC STILL CAMERA WITH PRINTER AND PRINTER WITH MONITOR

**RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111**

**MAIL STOP AMENDMENT**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Office Action dated August 12, 2004, please consider the comments as follows on the accompanying pages.

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-17 are all the claims pending in the application.

**I. Formalities**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging Applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 and for confirming that the certified copy of the priority document has been placed of record in the file.

However, as a formality, Applicant requests that the Examiner check boxes 12, 12 a) and 12 a) 1. on the Office Action Summary Sheet (form PTOL-326) in the next Office Action.

**II. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Erlichman (US 4,262,301) ["Erlichman"]. For at least the following reasons, Applicant traverses the rejection.

**Independent Claim 1**

Claim 1 recites an electronic still camera that comprises a monitor that displays an image "at substantially the same magnification as the image printed on the recording material." The Examiner contends that col. 13, lines 38-46 of Erlichman discloses this feature.

At most, this section discloses that images recorded on a magnetic tape are read into memory 20 and displayed on display device 24. There is no disclosure or suggestion in either this section or any other section that the displayed images are of the same magnification as the printed image.

In addition, claim 1 recites that "the monitor consists of pixels that are approximately equal in number to pixels of the image printed in a predetermined printing area of the recording material." The Examiner does not provide any analysis with respect to this feature.

However, Applicant submits that, at most, Erlichman discloses that the printer has a resolution of 200 lines/inch and a maximum diameter of 0.008 inch (col. 27, lines 40-45). There is no disclosure or suggestion in Erlichman that relates to the pixels of the monitor or that the pixels of the monitor are approximately equal in number to the pixels printed on the recording material.

Therefore, Erlichman does not disclose or suggest at least the above features, and therefore fails to teach or even suggest all of the claimed elements as required for a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

**Independent Claim 2**

Claim 2 recites an electronic still camera “wherein the monitor has a screen size that is approximately equal to a predetermined printing area of the recording material.” The Examiner contends that col. 13, lines 38-46 of Erlichman discloses this feature. Applicant disagrees.

As stated above in claim 1, this section of Erlichman only discloses that images stored on a tape may be displayed on a display device 24. Erlichman, at most, discloses that the printing area is 3” x 3” (col. 27, lines 41-42). There is no disclosure or suggestion in Erlichman that relates to the size of the display monitor or the claimed relationship between the size of the monitor and the predetermined printing area. Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 2 is patentable.

**Independent claim 7**

Claim 7 recites a printer “wherein the monitor consists of pixels that are approximately equal in number to pixels of the image printed in a predetermined printing area of the recording material.” Again, the Examiner does not provide any analysis with respect to this feature.

Because this feature is similar to that recited in claim 1, Applicant submits that claim 7 is patentable for at least a reason similar to that given above with respect to claim 1.

**Independent Claim 9**

Claim 9 recites a printer "wherein the monitor has a screen size that is approximately equal to a predetermined printing area of the recording material." The Examiner again cites col. 13, lines 38-46 as allegedly disclosing this feature.

Because this feature is similar to that recited in claim 2, Applicant submits that claim 9 is patentable for at least a reason similar to that given above with respect to claim 2.


**Dependent Claims**

Applicant submits that claims 3-6, 8, 10-17 are patentable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies.

**III. Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Bhaskar Kakarla  
Registration No. 54,627

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: November 12, 2004